

Boston University

1) Ellsberg, D Boston Univ. 3/2/83 (MB-GNotes)
Dept History, Faculty Seminar (H 2/14/83 + see tape)

Current Risks of Arms Race are
Resulting from interacting 2 Superpowers.
Hard to keep in focus that both US + USSR are
increasing human dangers. Not totally symmetric.

Nevertheless: try to understand current situation in effort
to resist it.

"Games" of Soviet Union: (eg Stalin) - has of
Life in Collectivization - Purges of 40's - (as R
Piper is always going) ^{+ even more} Compare Stalin's mass crimes to
current preparations for murder of half a billion.

Neither US nor USSR went into this war. It's a
conditional matter: to be turned on ^{under} certain
circumstances (aside from accident). ^{US (current)} ^{US (current)} ^{US (current)}
Crime of Stalin's compares to these preparations for
genocide (1st ^{or} 2nd) This entails Stalin's crimes.

(USA) We don't talk this way in USA - as it is a
minor crime (Do not select for indictment
a crime that you are equally guilty of) -

Up to Khrushchev - no "Pravda arms race"

USSR only to

As late as 1964, when SU had 4 ICBMs, US had

When people say "Deterrence has worked for 30 years -

All assume there was parity all along (Mutual Assured Destruction)

US had monopoly until Brezhnev said - 60% -
to his JCS -

2

In late 60's USSR began spending. & US had spent earlier (e.g. pouring concrete around silos)

Parity - 1968(9) but USA continued to ^{be ahead} _{by USSR}

race - USA (1983) technologically ahead.

USSR were "catching up" until 1968-9
(1st-use threats by USA were credible until late 60's
thus "deterrence" made more sense then

1958 - Taiwan Straits Crisis (When U.S. & Chinese clashed
close) & PRC had invaded Taiwan, Eisenhower

had authorized JCS for (ultimately) all-out strike
on PRC. (See H. Halperin) PRC backed down

& USSR withdrew nuclear threats. By 1960, split complete between
PRC & USSR. Khrushchev's "bluff" (We are producing nuclear
weapons like sausages) In 1962 - USSR had 10
operational missiles (4 ICBM's).

In period period, then - USSR was only
"Catching up"

Now (1983) Soviets are full active particip. in
the arms race. - Numbers not central now
but kinds of weapons are. Dangers lie in that
both sides are doing it. Now a new time - both
have vulnerable forces. (Each can disarm other if
it strikes first) US had monopoly in this for 20 years
(1963)

Re
CHINA

3)

1st period was stable - (US monopoly)

Period now is what people thought was happening in 1950's

"Cinderella" thinking is not new - (It ^{was} ~~was~~ ^{already in} around 1958-1963) We thought in 1958-71 war what, it now is, in fact. (Large missiles compensate for inaccuracy)
In early 1970's (Minsky) increased yield to weight ratios.

On every year - US doctrine has been to initiate an attack (No. 1st here not in our history)

Risks of a ~~first~~ fully surprise attack have been rejected by all prospects.

Weinberger is ruling out "preventive war" only
(We do have ^{now} "lose 'em or lose 'em")

We will not subscribe to "No-first-use" doctrine.

Many Present "rational" generals will say there are

* "orders of catastrophe" + if an attack is seen coming, will prefer to go first, not second.

US + USSR { Current weaponry are 1st-use weapons
(to be used in a preemptive strike)
(in contrast to 10 years ago)

4

Must assume USSR are blindly imitating USA
or must assume they don't want to be caught
by surprise (as in on Pearl Harbor or their
attack by Hitler)

When U.S.S.R increases inventory of SS-18 - doesn't
mean anything except for "Counterforce" power.

Anachronistic aspect of all this - (on both sides)
(USSR less committed to this role than USA)

Re Small-scale attacks:

Reagan's incentives (motives): (tho he could be
constrained by our democratic process) To induce by
public pressure on Reagan, cutbacks. Present scenario
is to come down (for a hole-in-one) at 100 miles!

Within next 3 years, a freeze may be unattainable
Must Stop Pershing, MX-tos immediately (Have
a movement now bigger than V-N in W. time) Must
try to stop it right now - (USSR are developing
SS-20's which is like Pershing) USSR threatens
to bring into E. Germany.

I don't trust the USSR not to do competitive
risk-taking (any more than USA).

Q: Why is USSR less committed to this role?
A: Officials from country (oil executives etc) to

No tape found to
check this with.